

## **REMARKS**

The applicants thank the examiner for initialing the reference listed in the Information Disclosure Statements (IDS) submitted on 17 February 2009, 19 March 2008, 30 May 2008, 9 August 2007 and 5 May 2006 and returning copies thereof. However, regarding the IDS submitted on 5 May 2006, the examiner apparently inadvertently failed to initial next to the reference 2004/0165865. A copy of the initialed copy in which the reference concerned in not initialed is attached to the present amendment. The applicants respectfully request that the examiner initial next to this reference and return the initialed copy with the next communication.

The undersigned would like to thank the examiner for the courtesies extended during the personal interview of 16 July 2009 during which the above-amendments and the comments below were discussed. The above amendments and following remarks reflect the substance of the personal interview.

Claim 2 has been amended. New claim 14 is presented for examination. The applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. For the reasons discussed below, claim 2, as amended, should now be in condition for allowance.

Claim 2 has been amended to recite the novel embodiment disclosed, for example, on pgs. 42-46 in which a value of the duration shown by the composition information is calculated by multiplying  $y$  by a display duration of each picture of the moving picture.

As described on pgs. 42-43, letting  $R_c$  denote the transfer rate from the object buffer to the graphics plane, the (window size)  $\times$  Frame Rate =  $R_c/2$ . Further, as described on pgs. 45-46, the value of the effect\_duration is obtained by multiplying, for example, PTS by the total data size of the windows divided by the transfer rate of the playback apparatus.

Therefore, because claim 2 is clearly described and enabled in the specification, the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-4, 6-9 and 11-13 were rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2006/0153532 to McCrossan *et al.* (hereafter: “McCrossan”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 2004/0168121 to Matz. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

McCrossan was published on 13 July 2006, subsequent to the international filing date of the present application (12 November 2004). Therefore, McCrossan at most qualifies as prior art under sections 35 U.S.C. 102(e). However, 35 U.S.C. 103(c) provides that subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under one or more of subsections (e), (f), and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the claimed invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Both U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0153532 to McCrossan and the present application were, at the time the claimed invention was made, owned by, or subject to an obligation of assignment to Matsushita Electrical Industries, which is now Panasonic Corporation.

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-9 and 11-13 should be withdrawn.

Claims 5 and 10 were rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2006/0153532 to McCrossan in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0168121 to Matz and in further view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, because U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0153532 to McCrossan and the present application were, at the time the claimed invention was made, owned by, or subject to an obligation of assignment to Matsushita Electrical Industries, which is now Panasonic Corporation, the rejection of claims 5 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn.

New claim 14 recites *inter alia* a recording medium including a graphics stream, which includes an interactive control segment (ICS) and a plurality of object definition segments (ODS). The interactive control segment includes a plurality of pieces of page information. Each object definition segment defines a graphics object (see pgs. 12 regarding ODS and ICS).

Each of the plurality of pieces of page information defines one of a plurality of interactive display compositions constituting a multi-page menu and includes an effect sequence and button information (see pgs. 32-35).

The button information specifies a graphics object used for presenting one state of a button, so that a corresponding one of the display compositions is presented on a corresponding page of the multi-page menu (see pg. 33).

The effect sequence constitutes by using graphics objects an in-effect to be presented preceding the corresponding page or an out-effect to be presented following the corresponding page and includes effect information (see pgs. 40-42).

The effect information defines a sequence of display compositions used for presenting the in-effect or the out-effect (see pg. 40, line 22 and pg. 41, line 6) and includes (i) a plurality of composition objects each defining a display composition to be presented in a bounding area of a graphics plane (see pg. 47, line 18 and pg. 49, line 13) and (ii) effect duration information indicating a duration after which one display composition rendered within the bounding area is replaced by a subsequent display composition to be rendered within the same bounding area (see pg. 45-46).

U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0153532 to McCrossan describes a technique of realizing certain effects such as Cut-In/Out, Fade-In/Out and scroll.

However, McCrossan fails to teach or suggest that either of these certain effects includes effect information defining a sequence of display compositions used for presenting the in-effect or the out-effect and including effect duration information indicating a duration after which one display composition rendered within the bounding area is replaced by a subsequent display composition to be rendered within the same bounding area as called for in claim 14.

Moreover, because the graphic stream in McCrossan is for playback of subtitle, the size of the graphic data is not very large. Accordingly, there is no risk that the transmission bandwidth required for realizing in-effect/out-effect is clogged, and thus no need for the system here to include effect duration information as recited in claim 14.

U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0168121 to Matz also fails to teach or suggest effect information which defines a sequence of display compositions used for presenting the in-effect or the out-effect and includes effect duration information indicating a duration after which one display composition rendered within the bounding area is replaced by a subsequent display composition to be rendered within the same bounding area as called for in claim 14.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. A timely notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If questions relating to patentability remain, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kerry S. Culpepper Reg. #45,672/

Kerry S. Culpepper  
Reg. No. 45,672

Panasonic Patent Center  
1130 Connecticut Ave., NW, Suite 1100  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Phone: 202-912-3800  
Fax: 202-912-0774  
Customer No. 42212